

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the Specification to correct a typographical error.

Claims 1, 7, 19 and 20 have been amended to define the claimed invention with greater specificity. Claims 11, 17, 18 and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone conference on October 6th in which the Examiner indicated that Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 2-6, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, would be allowable.

Claim 7 has been amended by incorporating the subject matter of Claims 18 and 21.

Support for the amendments is found in the Specification and Claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been added by the amendments. Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 1-10, 12-15 19-20 and 22 are pending. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19 and 21-22 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,958,555 to Takeuchi et al. ("Takeuchi"). The Examiner asserts that Takeuchi discloses a material comprising at least first and second creped sheets, wherein the crinkles of the creped sheets are aligned in a first direction and wherein the sheets are bonded by parallel rows of adhesive.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 7, as amended, are not anticipated by Takeuchi because Takeuchi fails to teach each and every element of Claims 1 and 7, as amended. More particularly, Applicant submits that Takeuchi fails to teach a single-ply article as claimed in Claim 1, as amended. Further, Applicant submits that Takeuchi fails to teach an article as claimed in Claim 7, as amended. More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that Takeuchi fails to teach, and in fact teaches away from, an article that comprises plies that exhibit substantially equal wet-extensibilities. Takeuchi, Col. 9, lines 9-23.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 7, as amended, are not anticipated by Takeuchi. Further, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 8-10, 12-15, 19 and 22 (Claims 11, 17 and 18 have been cancelled), which ultimately depend from Claim 7, as amended, are not anticipated by Takeuchi.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-22 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Takeuchi, discussed above. The Examiner

asserts that Takeuchi discloses a disposable article, however, the Examiner recognizes that Takeuchi does not teach a ratio of wet to dry caliper that is at least 1:1. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the appropriate adhesive row spacing, which Takeuchi teaches is related to the ratio of wet to dry caliper, through the process of routine experimentation in order to produce the optimum expansion of the sheet.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 7, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Takeuchi because Takeuchi fails to teach each and every element of Claims 1 and 7, as amended. More particularly, Applicant submits that Takeuchi fails to teach a single-ply article as claimed in Claim 1, as amended. Further, Applicant submits that Takeuchi fails to teach an article as claimed in Claim 7, as amended. More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that Takeuchi fails to teach, and in fact teaches away from, an article that comprises plies that exhibit substantially equal wet-extensibilities. To be clear, Takeuchi teaches that its article comprises plies that exhibit a "difference in the expansion ratio . . . of 20% or more to 80% or less." Takeuchi, Col. 9, lines 9-23. Applicant respectfully submits that a difference of 20% or more is not "substantially equal."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 7, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Takeuchi. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicant submits that Claims 2-6, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 8-10, 12-15, 19-20 and 22 (Claims 11, 17 and 18 have been cancelled), which ultimately depend from Claim 7, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Takeuchi. MPEP 2143.03.

Conclusion

WHEREAS Applicant has made an earnest effort to overcome the rejections of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein and a notice of allowance of Claims 1-10, 12-15, 19-20 and 22, as amended.

Customer # 27752
Cincinnati, OH
October 6, 2003
7005RAmdAftFinal

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 06 2003

Respectfully submitted,
NICHOLES JAMES NISSING

C. Brant Cook
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,151
(513) 634-1533

OFFICIAL